

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 24, 2004 LB 1049

and let Senator Cunningham see how many votes, and who they are, who are going to vote cloture on the bill. If you're not going to vote cloture, vote for this bracket motion, and he will see that he doesn't have 33 votes. But even if he gets 33 votes on my motion, meaning 33 will vote against bracketing, does that mean he'll get 33 for cloture? Maybe so and maybe not. But if he gets 33 for cloture, does that mean that the battle over this bill is at an end? I assure you that it is not. Now the gentleman who sits behind me is very distressed when I take this posture. He has written about it, which is his privilege. But what he thinks--and I mention him because he has written it and signed his name to it--and what others think, is of consequence only insofar as it has a bearing on the issue that is before us. It ought to be clear that I'm going to do all I can to stop a bill when I think it's bad. I think this bill is unsalvageable. There are bills which I do not like, but I can be prevailed upon to do work on the bill. And I don't see the youngest member of the body here at this point. Oh, but he can tell you that I can be persuaded to take a different point of view on a bill, even when the bill ultimately is for a person with whom I have had disputes and will have additional disputes. I'm talking about a bill that relates to the Attorney General and some things that he wants. This bill is not one of those that I will yield anything on. I want to see this bill die. I do not believe that the unemployment laws as they exist right now reward people for not working. Somebody was explaining to me that if you deliberately quit a job, each time you do it, you lose a certain amount of benefits that would be available to you, and at some point not too far down the line, you don't have anything that you can obtain in the way of unemployment benefits. So if somebody thinks this is a business that a person can go into, the person is out of business pretty quickly. Being disqualified for 7 to 10 weeks is long enough to punish a person for having left a job in a way that the policy of the state says is not acceptable. It does not need to be made harsher. Too many times a senator will have somebody in his or her district play the Chicken Little and say the sky is falling, and for that person all of the law of the state needs to be changed. In some areas where I don't think a lot of mischief will be worked, I may even support a measure of that kind, if it's one that merits changing even though it was brought to us by one disgruntled person. Not